

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

EDWARD SETH TRZASKA,

Case No. 2:22-cv-00634-RFB-VCF

Petitioner,

v.

ORDERSTATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Petitioner seeks an extension of time to file his opposition to Respondents' motion to dismiss. ECF Nos. 39, 40. The Court finds that the request is made in good faith and not solely for the purpose of delay, and therefore, good cause exists to grant Petitioner's motions.

Habeas actions are civil actions under federal practice and are subject to the reporting requirements of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 ("CJRA"), 28 U.S.C. § 471, *et seq.*¹ Given the Court's case management responsibilities under the CJRA, the number of extensions already granted, and the age of this case, moving forward counsel will be required to prioritize the briefing of the motion to dismiss in this case over later-filed matters.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Petitioner's third unopposed Motion to Extend Time (ECF No. 39) is GRANTED *nunc pro tunc*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's fourth unopposed Motion to Extend (ECF No. 40) is GRANTED. Petitioner has until July 19, 2024, to file his opposition to Respondents' motion to dismiss.

DATED: May 31, 2024.



RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The CJRA provides that each United States District Court must develop a civil justice expense and delay reduction plan to facilitate the deliberate adjudication of civil cases on the merits, monitor and improve litigation management, and reduce cost and delay. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 1 (noting the rules should be implemented to "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination" of each case). The CJRA mandates the early and on-going judicial management of case progress. 28 U.S.C. § 473(a).